

THE XX. CENTURY

VOL. IV

SHANGHAI, JANUARY 1943

No. 1

WAR AND REVOLUTION

By KLAUS MEHNERT

There is no single year in the history of the world that has seen such an abundance of great battles as has the year from December 1941 to December 1942, the year in which Germany, Japan, and Italy fought shoulder to shoulder and in which such battles as Pearl Harbor, Singapore, Burma, Kharkov, Sevastopol, Don Bend, North Caucasus, Solomon Islands, Stalingrad, Egypt, and Tunis were waged. Now that we can look back on the first year of this world conflagration, the time has come to gaze beyond the news of the day and to study the underlying currents of what is taking place.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

WHEN we read that the English language contains 170,000 words or that the Chinese language has 44,000 characters, we are impressed. And yet we often feel that our languages, in spite of their great vocabularies, lack the proper expressions, especially when it is a case of clarifying new developments.

Various competitions have been held during the past year for the purpose of finding a pertinent name for the present war. This is not a coincidence. So far no name has appeared which does justice to this world-encompassing event, and it cannot yet be foreseen by what name it will one day go down in history. The expression "Second World War" is unsatisfactory. It is true that the present conflict would bear the name "World War" with more justification than that of 1914/18, since at that time it was a war waged by the world against Central Europe, while today fighting is going on all over the globe. But the longer the present struggle lasts, the clearer does it become that the differences between it and that of 1914/18 are too great for both wars to be placed in the same category.

WARS AND WARS

For all great military conflicts we have only one term: "war." It is true that they have much in common. They all know fighting and sacrifice, killing, destruction, heroism, and suffering. But in addition there are also big differences. We need only glance at the pages of history to realize that the wars of the past fall into different groups. To name a few examples:

Wars of unification—in Italy and Germany during the nineteenth century.

Civil wars—the wars between Sulla and Marius in ancient Rome, the German Peasants War, the Civil War in North America.

Wars of conversion—Charlemagne against the Saxons, the Moslem expansion.

Dynastic wars—War of Spanish Succession, War of Austrian Succession.

Wars of migration—campaigns of the Goths, the Vandals, the Turks.

Feudal wars—the Taira-Mikamoto Period in Japan, the Wars of the Roses in England.

Wars of national uprising—the Balkan wars against Turkey, the Spanish wars against the Moors, the Netherlands war against Spain.

Wars of old powers against newcomers—the Punic Wars, the Seven Years' War, the Great War of 1914/18.

Wars of economic rivalry—Anglo-Dutch and Anglo-French wars over colonial possessions.

But how are the Thirty Years' War, the American War of Independence, the

wars of the French Revolution, and the present war to be classified? They belong to a group of their own which, for lack of a better expression, we shall call "revolutionary wars." For it is their most striking characteristic that they arose from revolutions—the Thirty Years' War from a religious revolution, the others from political and social revolutions.

THE GREAT REVOLUTION

Much in the present contest becomes clearer if we study the wars of the "Great Revolution," in which term we include the American as well as the French Revolution. The Great Revolution was a world-wide movement which originated in two countries: first in America in 1776 and then in France in 1789. This, too, is not a coincidence. America was the meeting-place of restless and dissatisfied Europeans, and France was then ruled by the most incompetent monarchy and nobility in all Europe.

The Great Revolution was directed against the *status quo* of that time, which is expressed by the words "absolutism" and "feudalism." Both these institutions had once been historically justified and had, in their day, been healthy forces in keeping with the spirit of the age. In the course of time, however, they had degenerated, like so many other forces in history, and had become fetters around the ankles of mankind. So new forces arose which were directed against the *status quo*.

The slogans under which these new forces fought must not all be accepted at their face value. The Great Revolution did not bring mankind much *Égalité* and *Fraternité*; essentially, it only replaced the former inequality of birth by one founded on possession. The true battle cries, however, from which the Great Revolution drew its strength, were:

Against the incompetent, irresponsible, pleasure-seeking monarchy like that of George III of England and Louis XV of France—for the liberty of the individual and for limitation of state authority by democracy and parliamentarism. Against exploitation by a degenerated nobility and land-owning class—for the protection of the property of enterprising, rising forces. Against an unprogressive church—for the liberation of the human mind

through rationalism. Against the medieval fetters of the guild system and against arbitrary levying of taxes and duties—for the freedom of commercial enterprise, for *laissez faire*. Against the unworthy treatment of women as chattels—for their emancipation.

In short, the Great Revolution fought for the liberty of the individual and his privileges, especially his possessions. According to the words of an American university textbook, the American constitution of 1787 was "the first important document designed to protect property against inroads of any kind"; and the French Revolution's "Declaration of the Rights of Man" (1789) calls property a "natural and imprescriptible right of Man, an inviolable and sacred right." But, much as is said in these documents about the rights and freedom of the individual, there is little to be found in them regarding his duties toward the community, and nothing at all about the obligations which his possessions entail.

THE VESTED INTERESTS GO TO WAR

It was this Revolution and the demands it represented that the vested interests of the monarchy, the nobility, and the clergy opposed at home and abroad.

This opposition, together with other sources of conflict existing at that time, led to the American War of Independence and the French revolutionary wars. All reactionary forces, headed by England, Hapsburg, Russia, and Prussia, were mobilized for the struggle against the Revolution and combined in constantly changing coalitions. In these wars, all advantages seem to have been on the side of reaction—a great tradition, mighty armies, governmental systems built up through centuries, vast reserves of men, great wealth, and a master mind in the person of Prince Metternich. And in spite of all that, they were overwhelmed by the young forces of the Revolution. The most famous regiments of the Emperors of Austria and Russia, of the Kings of Prussia and England, and many other crowned heads, crumbled before the élan of the new Today because they represented the old Yesterday and fought with its outdated methods. The great

April

Round Trip Through East Asia (Illustrated)	..	2:43
Mexico, The End of an Independence (Illustrated)	..	2:54
Cartoon of the Month	2:53
World War and International Law	2:53
The Path of the Bushi (Illustrated)	2:56
The Magazines of China (Illustrated)	..	2:59
Pearl Scowles (Illustrated)	2:57
Bohmeria "Humor"	2:52
The March of War in North Africa	..	2:58
The Brewery for Lovers. A Story	2:59
The Window: United States Army Morale	..	3:02
Book Review	3:03
Japanese Magazines	3:11
On the Screen	3:15
	..	3:17

May

The Winter War	Klaus Moberg	319
Beyond the Indo-Burmese Border (Illustrated)	Verner Jacobsen	330
After the Battle	William Schuman	352
Artist in Paradise	Elliott Paltielson	368
People of the South Seas (woodprints)	Fred Jespersen	363
The Birds Ought to Know	T. Takemachi	350
The Blood of the Earth	G. H. Schmidt	370
Hot Springs in Japan	Pictographs	375
Hanubai in China (Illustrated)	Alyfied Hofmann	380
The Man at the Mills	Ruth Wolf	383
Portuguese Short Stories :	
Drama	Jules Dumas	397
A Profitable Village	Pablo D'Almeida	396
Book Review	391
On the Screen	398

June

[illegible]

MAPS

Asean World, The	68	Mexico, Territorial Loans to USA	255
Africa, French North..	69	Morocco..	350
Africa, North, Allied Invasion In November, 1942	106	Poland, History	304
America, Aircraft Industry	166	Russian Front 1916-17	109
Caucasus Front, The North	339	Russian Front, Central Sector	66
Caucasus, Western	65	Russian Front, Northern Sector	331
China	314	Russian Front, Southern Sector	334
China, Fronts In	450	Siberian	322
Czech, Pre-Helladic	51	Tunisia	300
Eastern Europe, New Administrative Zones	87	USA, Southeastern Expansion	355
India, Northeast	341	World, Between 90 and 180 Degrees Eastern Longitude	368
Iran	297	World, Showing Distribution of US Garrison	76

German poet Goethe, who was present at the first conflict between the two armies at what is known as the Cannonade of Valmy, said at the time to some of the officers in the monarchist army: "From this day and place starts a new epoch in the history of the world, and you will be able to say that you were there." He was right.

The North American states gained total independence, and the French revolutionary armies threw back their enemies far beyond the borders of France. Not until Napoleon, who was the opportunist of the French Revolution and not its torchbearer, became unfaithful to the ideals of the Revolution and subjected the momentum unleashed by it to his personal ambition, did the fortune of war turn against the French armies. From being the sword of the Revolution they had turned into the tool of a new tyranny.

FERMENT AT HOME

For the development of the Revolution, Napoleon's defeats at Leipzig and Waterloo were of no consequence. Its ideas had already penetrated the other nations of Europe, and its march of victory had shifted from the battlefields to the domestic politics of the European states. In the ranks of the reactionary armies, the ideas of the French Revolution already began to ferment while the war against this Revolution was going on. Year by year these armies were influenced to an increasing extent by the very ideas which they had been sent out by their rulers to combat.

In England, a large part of public opinion was on the side of the Americans in their struggle for independence. The famous English author Horace Walpole expressed the feelings of many when he said that the Americans were fighting for his liberty as well as for their own. David Hume, the great English philosopher, stated that he was "American in principle," and in one of his last letters before his death he expressed the opinion that the English people were interested in the victory of the American Revolution, for otherwise

reaction would triumph at home too. The leading London newspapers condemned the Government's policy toward America. In many articles and biting statements sent in to the papers, signed with Roman names of the old Republican era, the Government was denounced for having begun an unjust war which, furthermore, it was totally incapable of conducting.

Indeed, the more farsighted among the monarchies, especially Prussia, voluntarily introduced many of the fundamental ideas of the Great Revolution into the life of their own states, adapting them to the needs, conditions, and ideas peculiar to their nations.

THE VICTORY OF THE REVOLUTION

The reforms of Stein and Hardenberg in Prussia in 1807 and 1808 and of Count Stadion in Austria, the emancipation of Latin America, the revolt of the Decembrists in Russia in 1825, the revolutions of 1830 in Belgium, Italy, and Poland, the English Reform Bill of 1832, the wave of revolutions in 1848 which shook all of Europe and forced even Metternich into exile, the revolts of the Italians against Hapsburg and of the Balkan nations against the Turks—these were all stages in the process of fermentation which had been started by the Great Revolution and whose effects reached into the third decade of the twentieth century. The Bolshevik Revolution as well as Marxism in general can be traced to it. The German Republic of 1919 based its slogans on the Great Revolution, as did the newly founded eastern European states of Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Indeed, its influence reached far beyond the Western world as far as East Asia, as was proved by the Chinese Revolution of 1911 and the temporary penetration of parliamentarism and liberalism into Japan.

Thus the Great Revolution was victorious more from historical necessity than through military successes. While its wars soon retreated into the pages of history, its ideas prevailed throughout the

4/19/48
 Pacific Relations
 Institute
 gift American

world within the course of a few generations, experiencing, of course, modifications in the various countries in accordance with their national characteristics.

No wonder that, in the circumstances, its champions arrived at the conviction that the ideas of the Great Revolution were fixed and eternal and that they represented the last logical step in human progress. But nothing is eternal, and everything is subject to evolution. Tomorrow, our today will be yesterday. What is today healthy and vital and in harmony with evolution may tomorrow be degenerated and destined to decay.

Thus it came about that, while the ideas of the Great Revolution were still on their victorious march around the world, new evils begotten by them began to become apparent. The one-sided emphasis on liberty for the individual finally led to a struggle of all against all, to the degeneration of political life, and through capitalism—its economic child—to millions of unemployed, to the absence of all security, and to bitter social strife.

THE NEW REVOLUTION

New forces of order began to develop against this chaos, forces for which history has as yet no generally accepted name and which we shall call the "New Revolution." This was the case in all countries but especially in Italy and Germany—the chief sufferers from the chaos—and in Japan, where the Japanese people began with unflinching instinct to turn back to their own values, which had been temporarily overshadowed by the ideas of the Great Revolution. The slogans of the New Revolution were announced, first singly and vaguely, then by growing numbers and with greater clearness:

Against democracy and parliamentarism, which had experienced their most undignified excesses in Italy, pre-Hitler Germany, and France—for the demand for leaders. Against chaotic *laissez faire* and selfish capitalism—for security and social justice, i.e., planning and socialism. Against limitless individualism—for the community. Against unconditional protection of ownership—for the idea of the obligation of the owner towards his nation. Against the unnatural emancipation of women—for their return into the fold of family

and nation. Against conceited and shallow rationalism—for faith in spiritual values.

The relationship of both revolutions towards nationalism is a separate question of special interest. Both underwent important changes. The Great Revolution began with ideas which were addressed to all mankind, and it ended with the creation of that extreme nationalism which put its mark on the nineteenth century in Europe and elsewhere. The New Revolution started out with nationalistic slogans, yet it has led during the last few years to the creation of super-national *Grossraums* in Europe and East Asia. Italian and German nationalism has extended to "Europeanism," and Japan's insular Nipponism has developed into the idea of the Co-Prosperity Sphere.

THE FOUR PILLARS OF REACTION

Hardly had the nature and the significance of the New Revolution become known to the world when the same thing occurred that had happened a hundred and fifty years before. The vested interests of the whole world rose in opposition. The result was war. Of those who fought for the maintenance of the *status quo*, many have disappeared—for example, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. Others are undergoing a change, like France, Scandinavia, China, and parts of South America. The main pillars of reaction are the United States, Great Britain, and Jewry, which latter has realized that it would lose the position it gained in the nineteenth century should the New Revolution be victorious.

The last ally to enter the camp of reaction was the Soviet Union. In the article "Bolshevism and Its Pedigree" (October 1941), we tried to explain the many contradictions to be found in Bolshevism by the contention that Bolshevism is the child of two totally different parents, and that its history is an unending struggle between their opposing influences. On the one side, Bolshevism is rooted in the ideas of the Great Revolution, i.e., in the dogma of the emancipation of the individual; on the other, in the belief in the almightiness of the

State and the collective. Bolshevism was never able to overcome the tension between these two poles. There were times when its metamorphosis and its linking up with the ideas of the New Revolution did not seem entirely impossible. But through its connection with Washington and London, the Soviet Union, with those areas which are still ruled by Bolshevism, has become the fourth pillar of reaction. As a reward it has, for one and a half years now, been made to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Allies, the very thing that Stalin, according to his famous declaration made in the spring of 1939, wished to avoid.

THEN AS NOW

It is not the purpose of this article to compare the two revolutions as regards their values, methods, or personalities. In all these fields there are vast differences between the two. But in one point they are alike: they are revolutions of world-wide significance. One cannot read about the wars of the French Revolution without being constantly reminded of the events of the last few years. Then as now, England and Russia were in the camp of reaction. Then as now, it was above all the refugees, who, being able neither to forget nor to learn, stirred up hatred abroad for the revolution. Then as now, the reaction issued solemn declarations in favor of the disappearing *status quo*. (In the Declaration of Pillnitz of August 27, 1791, the leaders of the reaction of that time demanded recognition of the monarchistic principle and of the traditional order in France; in their Atlantic Charter of 1941, Roosevelt and Churchill insisted on the restoration of the world of yesterday.) Then as now, the members of the antirevolutionary coalition showed mutual distrust and a general indecisiveness; even during the eighteenth century they carried on negotiations among each other which remind one of the bickering over the Second Front during the last few months. (The Russians, whose troops were wanted by the Allies on the Rhine, spread rumors about their armies being on the march to the west while these armies actually re-

mained in Poland, which lay much closer to Russia and in which she was far more interested. The Tsarina urged the German states to wage war on the Revolution in the West in order to have a free hand herself in Eastern Europe.) Then as now, the Allies made desperate attempts to incite civil war with the aid of reactionary elements in the revolutionary camp. Then as now, Dunkirk saw the English for a while as unbidden guests, and Toulon was the scene of a betrayal of the cause of the Revolution.

THE NEW METTERNICH

The present coalition of reaction has found its Metternich in Franklin D. Roosevelt. In numerous speeches, this man has expounded the ideological basis underlying his actions. In doing this, he has tried to create the impression that he personifies progress while the Axis represents retrogression. He does not seem to see that the wheel of history has turned during the last hundred and fifty years and that the Great Revolution, which he still professes to represent, has been replaced by a New Revolution. And yet he need only look around to realize that he himself is no longer in harmony with the ideas he champions. All around him, the new ideas are penetrating his camp, and while he is making anti-totalitarian speeches he is forced to introduce one totalitarian measure after another.

A great deal of that which, until recently, was attacked by the American press as "totalitarian barbarism," as "medieval," has not only been taken over but been declared a patriotic duty. Even from the little news reaching us from America since December 8, 1941, it can clearly be seen that some of the main supports of capitalism have already crumbled there. The very fact that the President has fixed prices, wages, and rents by compulsory measures and has rationed innumerable articles of daily use, means that he has withdrawn them from the "free play of forces," that ideal of the nineteenth century. In view of the constant creation of new authorities, the

ever-extending system of permits, and the gigantic placing of government orders with private concerns—which thereby come under State control—the hitherto free businessman of America is well on the way towards becoming a government employee. In fact, he may even disappear entirely, as is the case—according to the words of Undersecretary of Commerce Wayner C. Taylor—with one third of a million retail shops which have been declared “superfluous” by the State and must close down and dismiss their one and a half million employees by the middle of 1943.

At the same time, Roosevelt is cutting down those privileges of the American workers through which the capitalist system has tried to make labor forget that it is at the mercy of capital. This applies above all to their freedom of movement. In September 1942, Chairman McNutt of the Man Power Commission declared that uncontrolled labor must be done away with: “We must contemplate the eventuality of complete suppression of the system by which workers may choose their jobs We cannot avoid the institution of a universal compulsory labor service.” (Havas, 16.9.42.) Workmen and employees are already only allowed to give up their positions if a special permit has previously been obtained from the US Employment Bureau (DNB, Lisbon, 1.6.42).

HARRY HOPKINS PAINTS THE FUTURE

In a recent issue of the *American Magazine*, the closest personal friend and collaborator of Roosevelt's, Harry Hopkins, contributed an extremely interesting article in which he predicts the obligatory employment of women in war industries, the conversion of American universities into army and navy training centers, obligatory savings, the general prohibition of strikes, and the prohibition for all workers to leave their jobs for better remunerated ones, and declares that all details of the daily life of each citizen will be carefully regulated by the Government. According to Mr. Hopkins, the day will come when Americans will no longer

be allowed to travel or telegraph without special permission, which will only be granted in exceptional circumstances (Stefani, Buenos Aires, 6.11.42).

In Great Britain the situation is similar. The British Government recently commissioned Sir William Henry Beveridge to study the problems of the postwar world. His report was made known a few weeks ago. It is characterized by such strong emphasis on socialistic principles that the London Stock Exchange experienced a slump! (Domei, Lisbon, 28.11.41.)

A FILE OF CUTTINGS

From 1939 to 1941, I collected cuttings from American dailies and magazines in which American authors recommended the study and imitation of certain of the measures taken by totalitarian states. This file became fatter and fatter, especially after the victorious German campaigns of the summer of 1940. Not only the merits of the German Army were praised, but also the miracle of German war financing and the achievements in the field of hygiene, social welfare, and labor protection, as well as her “Strength Through Joy” organization, her youth training, agricultural reforms, etc.

How is this swing from the ideas of the Great Revolution towards those of the totalitarian states to be explained? Certainly not only by the fact that America is at war. Many of the symptoms of the penetration of the new ideas in America were to be found years before her involvement in the war. The chief reason for this swing lies in the fact that America saw herself unable to master new problems with the old methods.

On the one side, misery and unemployment grew in spite of the WPA and all other government aid organizations; and on the other the national debts ensuing from these measures grew even faster. It seemed like a galloping disease that consumes the body, for the treatment of which there was no remedy to be found among the ideas of the Great Revolution.

In reply to this it might be said that America had the highest standard of

living in the world, and that for this reason it was not necessary for her to obtain her ideas from other nations. Now there is hardly a more disputed subject than the comparison between different standards of living. One can measure the standard of living according to the number of motorcars and refrigerators, or according to the degree of personal contentment and the cultural level of a nation. But even if we consider the standard of living purely from a material point of view, we must not judge from the picture of America presented by Hollywood. We must also consider the grave social defects—millions of unemployed, slums, "poor whites" in the Southern states, etc.—which existed in America before the introduction of totalitarian measures and which to a large extent still exist today. In the same way, England does not only consist of Piccadilly and Regent Street but also of the depressed areas. The fact that American and English soldiers are fighting today for this America and this England is no proof to the contrary. The appeal to patriotism and the application of discipline have always been effective. The imperial and royal armies of the eighteenth century also fought at first for their masters against the armies of the American and French Revolutions.

THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW

When the first totalitarian measures were introduced in America, the champions of reaction consoled themselves with the thought that these were emergency measures, produced by the crisis in international relations during the last few years, which would disappear again with the crisis. Doubtless many of the restrictions by which the life of the individual is now governed in the various nations will be removed when the war is over and life becomes more normal again. But the fundamental law of the New Revolution, "*Common good must come before personal advantage*," must remain.

It is one of the outstanding contributions of the New Revolution that it has shown the middle way between the

"Almighty Individual" of Liberalism and the "Almighty State" of Bolshevism, the middle way which combines the planful guidance of the State with the creative initiative of the individual. While the democracies claim to be fighting for the principle of individualism, infinitely more outstanding individuals in the political and military fields are to be found in Germany, Japan, and Italy than in the Anglo-Saxon camp. It is just that overwhelming group spirit and feeling of responsibility toward their nations that helps to explain men like Hitler and Mussolini, like the countless Japanese, German, and Italian heroes who have immortalized their names in this war.

It is significant that the problem of postwar America is already being seriously discussed in American newspapers and periodicals, and that all writers seem to agree that even after the war a return to the so-called free economy will be impossible unless one wishes to bring on grave social crises. Roosevelt himself had to admit this when, in January 1942, in a declaration concerning the "freedom of Man after the war," he promised the Americans security in old age and sickness, the right to work, just wages, and protection of the worker against unscrupulous employers—all things, incidentally, which in Germany have for years been taken for granted.

SHORTER SHIRTS

Those who have followed our reflections so far might say: Are not then the two camps into which the present world is split fundamentally alike? The reply is: Unfortunately not. Otherwise this war would never have taken place. The difference is that, in the case of the Axis powers, the New Revolution with its ideas and forms of organization has grown organically and is acknowledged by leaders and people alike, so that in their case ideology and reality coincide. The democracies, however, are in the embarrassing situation of having to introduce measures, to combat which they are supposed to have gone to war. The American soldier is expected to fight for the traditional American way of life

while at the same time one bit after another of this life is vanishing. The American people are exhorted every day to make new sacrifices for the cause of freedom, while Roosevelt is appointing one dictator after another (price dictator, food dictator, etc.) and himself requests more and more dictatorial power.

Yet the leaders of America are not acting with the clarity and sureness of the Prussian reformers of 1807, who consciously and from conviction took over some of the ideas of the French Revolution for their own country. On the contrary, they are acting against their will, under camouflage, and in constant contradiction to their own declarations. Instead of carrying out large-scale basic measures, as in Germany, Roosevelt must, because of this contradiction, be content with inadequate half-measures and solutions. Surely it is amateurish for the American Government to substitute a comprehensive plan by decrees to the effect that suits must have fewer buttons and may not be double-breasted, that men's trousers may not have cuffs, that football players must wear Nylon shorts instead of woollen ones, and that, from December 15, shirts must be three inches shorter (TO, Lisbon, 27.11.42).

So much of Roosevelt's social legislation is opposed by many of the finest and most open-minded Americans, not because they are against the New Revolution, but because they feel that Roosevelt is not its representative. They feel that whatever he may take over from its new ideas, he does, not as part of a sound and all-embracing plan, but as a makeshift expediency.

THE TYPE OF MEN NEEDED

What the democracies lack above all is men who are able to translate the new ideas into deeds.

One cannot, like America, build up unlimited free economy for a hundred and fifty years and preach unlimited liberalism of the individual and the principle of *laissez faire*, and then suddenly expect one day to have the cadres to build up a State-directed nation. For

this, men are required who throughout their lives have been trained mainly to see themselves as servants of the whole and not as individuals responsible only to themselves. The formation of such cadres takes a long time. Germany has been working at this task since the days of Frederick the Great's father, that is to say, more than two hundred years, to rear men who think first of their duty and only then of themselves. And Japan has been doing this almost throughout her history. If one attempts to create a planned economy with men who were trained in the traditions of individualism and who have always seen the world only in relation to themselves, the result of the unhappy combination of great power placed in the hands of men without the proper sense of responsibility is that measure of corruption about which we hear so much from America.

In the Axis countries, the leaders as well as the entire nation stand behind the New Revolution; in the democratic camp, the majority of the people are instinctively, if not consciously, in favor of this revolution, while the leaders only adopt its methods because compelled to do so by circumstances. The chief trouble with the democratic countries lies in the confusion and the intellectual dishonesty apparent in this cleavage between ideology and practice. One cannot repeat the slogans of the Great Revolution about the freedom of the individual and at the same time promise security, just wages, and the right to work. All these things are possible only in a planned community. And a planned community is possible only through the subordination of the individual, in other words the renunciation of the privileges upon which he has been accustomed to insist since the Great Revolution.

Of course, the leaders of democracy are conscious of this inner cleavage and are attempting to gloss it over. One of the methods used for this purpose, and one which will probably be employed even more in future, is a strong emphasis on Christianity. Notwithstanding their alliance with Bolshevism, the democracies

claim to be the champions of Christianity and try to make Christianity, as they see it, serve as a bridge between the existing contradictions.

THE FINAL OUTCOME

A year ago we pointed out in our article "The World at War" (January 1942) that actually the nations in both camps have a similar vision of the post-war world. But after a year of this world conflict we must add: There is a great danger that Roosevelt and Churchill will succeed in covering up this basic fact by whipping up emotions which are on an entirely different plane—hatred, revenge, patriotism. Their whole propaganda apparatus is aimed at this. In this way, they hope that the absurdity of the war may not become apparent to their peoples. They are trying to make their nations forget entirely why this war is really being fought and to fill them with such beside-the-point emotions as: "Revenge for Pearl Harbor." But even should they succeed in this, it will only cause the conflict to last longer and the number of victims to be greater; the final outcome will not be changed. For just as in the hearts of the soldiers and officers of the reactionary armies of the eighteenth century there was, at first often unconscious, sympathy for the ideals against which they were fighting, there is receptiveness in the present-day reactionary armies of democracy for the

ideas of the New Revolution. While they are fighting against the new order, neither they nor their leaders know of any other order to suggest.

When the French soldiers of the revolutionary armies in their new individualism went forward in loose formation against the imperial and royal regiments, which according to approved practice marched in close ranks as if on a parade ground, they may have shivered slightly at the newness of their own method of battle. Yet they knew that final victory was certain for them and for the new age which they represented. And when in the course of those wars the armies of reaction saw themselves obliged to adjust themselves to the battle methods of the Revolution, they had already lost the war in the field of ideas, even though they were still to win a few victories on the battlefield.

When the soldiers of Germany, Japan, and Italy, in their newly won sense of community, in fanatical devotion to their country, and in faith in their leaders, broke through allegedly impregnable fortifications, defended by individualists who were concerned mainly about themselves, they had already grasped final victory. And at the moment when their opponents began to take over the battle cries and methods of the New Revolution, they lost the war politically and ideologically even before it had started properly in the military sense.

He that will not apply new remedies, must expect new evils.

Francis Bacon